



Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer
of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction

RESOURCE MOBILISATION CONTACT GROUP

**Resources to Achieve the Convention's Humanitarian Aims:
A Preliminary Review**

**Presented to the Standing Committee on the General Status and
Operation of the Convention**

**Norway
Coordinator of the Resource Mobilisation Contact Group**

3 February 2003

Resources to Achieve the Convention's Humanitarian Aims: A Preliminary Review

I. Introduction

At the Fourth Meeting of the States Parties, in the context of reviewing the general status and operation of the Convention, and in the context of a subsequent discussion on assistance and co-operation, it was recalled that States Parties in a position to do so committed themselves on a long-term basis to sustain the process of achieving the Convention's humanitarian aims, and that States Parties should continue to give high priority to mine action within their development and humanitarian policies, particularly with a view to the Convention's 10-year time frame for mine clearance.

Norway contributed to these discussions by presenting a non-paper that stated the need to explore all avenues for mobilising resources to achieve the Convention's humanitarian aims. These means include:

- Current traditional donors, which should be encouraged to renew financial commitments;
- Mine affected States Parties, which should be encouraged to provide domestic resources in support of national programmes;
- Multilateral agencies and development banks, which could be encouraged to consider how they could enhance their involvement in support of the Convention's implementation;
- Mine affected States and non-traditional State donors, which could examine how they could share experiences and technical support with one another;
- The private sector, which could be further mobilized to contribute to mine action; and,
- More effectively linking the needs of mine-affected countries with the donor community, to ensure that available resources are used in a best possible manner.

The purpose of this document is to provide a preliminary review of resources emanating from each of these areas. While those who have contributed to resources should receive due credit, the intention of this review is not to be self-congratulatory. Rather, it is hoped that certain lessons and observations can be drawn from the past that will help chart a course towards ensuring the necessary support is in place in the future to meet our aims.

II. Acknowledgements

The Coordinator of the Contact Group would like to thank those States Parties that responded to the Coordinator's questionnaire: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Croatia, Honduras, Jordan, Malawi, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Thailand, Yemen and Zimbabwe. In addition, the Coordinator would like to thank all other States Parties that have provided information, either directly or through the UNMAS Mine Action Investments database, as well as those organizations that have served as important sources for information.

III. Preliminary Observations

A. Traditional Donors

Data compiled for this review point to States in a position to assist others having contributed almost US\$ 1.12 billion for mine action over the past six years, with almost US\$ 0.68 billion of this having been provided by 32 States Parties to the Convention. (Note: The European

Commission – an organization of which the vast majority of its members are States Parties, contributed over US\$ 100 million of the US\$ 1.12 billion total amount from budgetary resources other than those of its member States.)

The annual contributions of these donors in each of 1999, 2000 and 2001 – and likely in 2002 totalled over US\$ 200 million. This is remarkable given that public awareness of the landmine issue was at its peak in 1997. While it may be difficult for a US\$ 200+ million figure to remain constant far in the future, it is essential that those who have provided funds in the past examine how they can renew their commitments to sustain efforts that will need ongoing support.

B. Mine Affected States Parties

While often overlooked, the mine affected States Parties to the Convention have made substantial contributions to addressing the humanitarian impact of landmines within their borders. The 13 mine affected States Parties that responded to the Contact Group Coordinator's questionnaire alone have applied more than US\$ 165 million in mine action funding and in-kind resources since 1997. Indeed, in many of these countries the financial commitment to mine action has grown over time to the point when in 2002 these 13 States Parties dedicated to mine action resources totalling almost US\$ 37 million.

One interesting observation which can be drawn from the experiences of these mine affected States Parties is the diversity of domestic resources for mine action that exist. In addition to State budgets providing funds to national mine action programmes and mine action centres, the armed forces in many instances have made significant contributions to mine action. In addition, as has been demonstrated by at least two countries – Croatia and Peru – state-owned enterprises can play a significant role in funding mine action.

In response to the Contact Group Coordinator's questionnaire, several mine affected States Parties indicated the priority they attach to mine action through the link they draw between the application of the Convention and national development plans and poverty reduction strategies. For example, Chad has noted that “mine action activities are fully co-ordinated with other social-economic development programmes” as demonstrated by the fact that its National High Commission for Demining rests within the Ministry of Economic Development and Co-operation.

In some cases, a link between mine action and poverty reduction has been made through the process of developing and implementing Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSP) or Interim PRSPs – documents which are designed to provide the basis for assistance from the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. At least two States Parties – Cambodia and Guinea Bissau – make mention of mine action in their I-PRSPs, and a third – Bosnia and Herzegovina – has included as an annex to its draft PRSP a detailed strategy on demining as a sector priority. In addition, at least one State Party – Mozambique – has indicated that one of the key objectives of its five-year national mine action plan is to contribute to the Government of Mozambique's poverty reduction strategy.

C. Multilateral agencies and development banks

Multilateral agencies to date have played an important role in helping States Parties achieve the aims of the Convention and undoubtedly will be called upon to ensure the sustainability of efforts to implement the Convention. For their part, the World Bank and the regional development banks should also be considered important means of acquiring resources for mine action. Some States Parties, such as Bosnia and Herzegovina and Croatia, have already accessed

World Bank loans. In addition, other States Parties like Afghanistan have benefited from grants provided by the World Bank's Post Conflict Fund for mine action initiatives.

D. Mine affected States and non-traditional State donors

A great deal of capacity has been developed in some mine affected countries which logically could be of benefit to other mine affected States. In fact, in many cases this capacity already has been shared by mine affected States Parties. For example, in response to the Contact Group Coordinator's questionnaire, both Honduras and Nicaragua indicated that they have contributed to the mine action effort in Peru. For its part, Peru has stated that it has the capacity to participate in demining as part of peacekeeping operations. Yemen has stated that it is having discussions regarding how it could apply its extensive experience, knowledge and capacity to tackle the landmine problem in Lebanon. Chad has indicated that other African countries have expressed an interest in learning for the Chadian experience.

During meetings of the Standing Committees and in Landmine Monitor it has been noted that some States Parties that are not considered to be traditional donors also have made meaningful contributions to mine action. The actions of these States Parties may provide useful examples to others with respect to the variety of valuable contributions that can be made to help implement the Convention.

- Argentina military personnel have carried out demining and explosive ordnance disposal operations in Kuwait as part of a UN peacekeeping mission.
- Experts from Brazil have participated in mine action efforts in Central America and Angola, and Brazil has indicated that it is exploring new options for cooperation in international humanitarian demining activities.
- Malaysia's Defence Cooperation Programme includes a component to help train developing countries in demining and mine destruction.
- Mexico has been a long-standing participant in the Pan American Health Organization's Tri-Partite Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration programme.
- Peace keepers from Uruguay have cleared vast tracks of mined land in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

E. The Private Sector

While information on private sector support to mine action is more difficult to obtain, it is possible to account for more than US\$ 10 million in contributions to mine action by private sector actors over the past six years. What is most remarkable about the information obtained on private sector contributors is the diversity of actors involved in supporting mine action.

IV. Conclusions

This overview has identified resources valued at more than US\$ 1.32 billion that have been applied to mine action over the past six years. However, what is more important than the absolute value of contributions is the affirmation of the importance that we must attach to investigating all means available to us to generate the resources necessary to meet the Convention's aims. Implementing the Convention is a State responsibility. Nevertheless, partnership with civil society and international actors is important. As can be seen, a wide variety of mechanisms and approaches exists to support those charged with eliminating anti-personnel mines and assisting victims within their borders. We must seek to enhance and maximise these means and better respond to the needs of mine affected communities as we proceed together towards the fulfilment of the Convention's promise.

Table 1A: Mine Action Funding 1997-2002 (States Parties)

	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	Total
Andorra			\$10'000	\$21'600	\$11'750		
Australia		\$6'920'000	\$7'606'500	\$6'417'700	\$6'800'000	\$6'700'000	
Austria*	\$18'348	\$240'000	\$1'310'337	\$2'146'503	\$888'494	\$980'380	
Belgium	\$5'895'000	\$6'297'000	\$3'115'007	\$3'722'250	\$3'157'138	\$3'446'567	
Brazil						\$305'392	
Canada	\$4'304'431	\$9'458'748	\$15'374'274	\$14'668'339	\$17'884'656	\$15'068'209	
Czech Republic	\$6'000	\$50'000	\$67'100	\$91'000	\$50'000	\$50'000	
Denmark	\$360'000	\$1'400'000	\$7'800'000	\$4'400'000	\$4'907'055		
France*+			\$5'500'000	\$6'770'000	\$2'694'000	\$44'995	
Germany*	\$7'226'061	\$14'815'126	\$8'920'500	\$10'030'500	\$11'080'997	\$1'577'000	
Holy See				\$10'000			
Hungary			\$3'000	\$85'000	\$80'148		
Iceland	\$5'000						
Ireland*	\$171'300	\$64'000	\$624'680	\$1'467'745	\$1'276'514	\$187'300	
Italy	\$3'445'187	\$1'141'091	\$5'188'230	\$1'713'343	\$6'229'309	\$9'843'184	
Japan	\$2'084'644	\$4'757'860	\$11'979'206	\$11'900'000	\$6'979'000		
Liechtenstein*	\$20'134	\$19'736	\$13'628	\$42'201	\$50'000	\$30'106	
Luxembourg*		\$600'000	\$723'586	\$701'127	\$718'896	\$102'209	
Malta					\$2'000		
Monaco	\$9'000	\$8'519	\$14'110	\$14'000	\$14'000	\$15'000	
Netherlands	\$9'608'815	\$22'191'000	\$9'879'314	\$18'600'457	\$12'516'492	\$15'806'868	
New Zealand*	\$1'847'250	\$1'291'300	\$1'014'250	\$734'712	\$272'290	\$146'982	
Norway	\$13'281'432	\$23'737'375	\$21'964'679	\$19'333'137	\$19'633'355	\$25'612'343	
Portugal			\$40'000	\$44'166	\$56'080		
Qatar			\$199'980				
Slovak Republic		\$686'456	\$35'548	\$185'000			
Slovenia		\$1'300'000	\$1'662'335	\$212'648	\$418'373	\$362'533	
South Africa			\$73'612	\$35'000	\$40'654		
Spain	\$1'166'666	\$1'010'666	\$1'187'447	\$500'000	\$667'221		
Sweden*	\$11'900'000	\$16'600'000	\$2'100'000	\$7'900'000	\$8'500'000	\$372'448	
Switzerland*	\$4'000'000	\$200'000	\$4'372'600	\$7'520'000	\$8'428'000	\$8'920'680	
United Kingdom*	\$7'205'073	\$7'162'508	\$20'202'095	\$22'900'000	\$17'280'000	\$1'431'399	
Totals	\$72'554'341	\$119'951'385	\$130'982'018	\$142'166'428	\$130'636'421	\$91'003'595	\$687'294'188

Sources of data used in this table:

black = Mine Action Investments Database or direct from the donor

red = Article 7 reports

blue = Landmine Monitor

green = UNMAS Voluntary Trust Fund data

purple = International Trust Fund (ITF) Newsletters

orange = ICRC Mine Action Special Reports

gray = mixed sources used

* = Some figures for these donors likely make up only a portion of total contributions for the years given.

+ = Sizable contributions were made in years left blank but disaggregating information by year was not possible.

As of 30 January 2003

Table 1B: Mine Action Funding 1997-2002 (States not Parties)

	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	Total
China		\$100'000			\$1'260'000		
Finland	\$4'478'000	\$6'375'000	\$5'683'200	\$4'836'600	\$4'566'000	\$4'788'400	
Greece					\$80'000		
Korea, Republic of	\$150'000	\$50'000	\$55'000	\$330'000	\$120'000		
Kuwait			\$250'000				
Poland			\$10'057	\$15'338			
Saudi Arabia					\$3'000'000		
UAE*					\$200'000	\$1'746'431	
United States*	\$45'500'000	\$39'427'438	\$56'846'182	\$78'584'332	\$62'851'000	\$15'603'398	
Totals	\$50'128'000	\$45'952'438	\$62'844'439	\$83'766'270	\$72'077'000	\$22'138'229	\$336'906'375

Table 1C: Mine Action Funding 1997-2002 (Other)

	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	Total
EC*	\$6'159'000	\$17'799'400	\$23'912'000	\$23'033'483	\$25'917'875	\$2'939'022	
European Agency for Reconstruction						\$2'664'519	
Islamic Conference				\$150'000			
Totals	\$6'159'000	\$17'799'400	\$23'912'000	\$23'183'483	\$25'917'875	\$5'603'541	\$102'575'299

Sources of data used in these tables:

black = Mine Action Investments Database

red = Article 7 reports

blue = Landmine Monitor

green = UNMAS Voluntary Trust Fund data

purple = ITF Newsletters

orange = ICRC Mine Action Special Reports

brown = Organization's web site

* = Some figures for these donors likely make up only a portion of total contributions for the years given.

Table 1D: Mine Action Funding 1997-2002 (Total Traditional Donors)

	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	Total
States Parties	\$72'554'341	\$119'951'385	\$130'982'018	\$142'166'428	\$130'636'421	\$91'003'595	
States not Parties	\$50'128'000	\$45'952'438	\$62'844'439	\$83'766'270	\$72'077'000	\$22'138'229	
Other	\$6'159'000	\$17'799'400	\$23'912'000	\$23'183'483	\$25'917'875	\$5'603'541	
Totals	\$128'841'341	\$183'703'223	\$217'738'457	\$249'116'181	\$228'631'296	\$118'745'365	\$1'126'775'862

As of 30 January 2003

Table 2: Mine Action Funding 1997-2001 (Mine Affected States Parties)

	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	Total
Bosnia Herzegovina				\$25'988	\$170'641	\$1'328'200	
Chad		\$676'667	\$293'334	\$539'667	\$958'333	\$1'066'667	
Croatia	\$11'157'372	\$13'763'908	\$17'694'347	\$14'048'876	\$15'932'225	\$17'864'878	
Honduras	\$18'865	\$190'059	\$250'974	\$280'796	\$333'224	\$549'488	
Jordan	\$4'397'163	\$5'886'525	\$6'312'057	\$6'382'979	\$5'815'603	\$6'312'057	
Malawi	\$14'440	\$1'609	\$15'696	\$10'589	\$16'645	\$1'292	
Mauritania			\$350'000	\$850'000	\$850'000	\$850'000	
Mozambique	\$404'858	\$404'858	\$454'772	\$590'708	\$766'258	\$598'381	
Nicaragua	\$1'680'000	\$1'680'000	\$1'680'000	\$3'524'500	\$3'524'500	\$3'524'500	
Peru	\$23'669	\$23'669	\$150'669	\$36'120	\$47'240	\$462'925	
Thailand			\$316'731	\$621'736	\$898'230	\$929'822	
Yemen			\$1'000'000	\$1'500'000	\$3'000'000	\$3'500'000	
Zimbabwe	\$82'568	\$84'463	\$65'272	\$67'540	\$76'349	\$174'813	
Totals	\$17'778'935	\$22'711'758	\$28'583'852	\$28'479'498	\$32'389'248	\$37'163'023	\$167'106'314

Sources of data used in this table:

Black = Reported by the State Party in response to the Contact Group Coordinator's questionnaire

As of 30 January 2003

Table 3: Mine Action Funding 1997-2002 (Development Banks)

	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	Total
World Bank (Grants)		\$350'000		\$90'000	\$1'000'000		
World Bank (Loans)	\$7'500'000	\$2'074'095	\$4'733'958	\$4'067'988	\$7'459'581	\$5'050'142	
Totals	\$7'500'000	\$2'424'095	\$4'733'958	\$4'157'988	\$8'459'581	\$5'050'142	\$32'325'765

Sources of data used in this table:

Mine action funding attributed to the World Bank

As of 30 January 2003

Table 4: Mine Action Funding 1997-2002 (Private Sector / Civil Society)

	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	Total
Adria Airways			\$31'718				
CARE International			\$97'557				
Coordinametni Donne						\$13'028	
Community Centre Sarjevo				\$23'706	\$16'255	\$168'012	
Community Hadzici						\$23'801	
Croatia Without Mines			\$42'554		\$31'148	\$83'305	
Daewoo			\$29'805				
Dinners Club Adriatic				\$125'000			
Elektroprivreda Mostar					\$116'921		
Elting Pale					\$18'587		
Europe Press				\$24'385			
Ford Foundation					\$34'700	\$40'700	
Foundation Prapioz				\$14'790			
Global Care Unlimited					\$15'000	\$15'000	
HI Switserland, private donations to	\$471'257	\$570'591	\$477'245	\$1'046'846	\$789'665		
Kiwanis Clubs (Canada)				\$16'096			
McKnight Foundation						\$30'000	
Rehabilitation Institute			\$39'544	\$22'418	\$5'970		
Roots of Peace				\$121'275	\$30'000		
Reuters				\$7'750			
Rotary International			\$337'502				
Rotary (Canada)				\$61'682			
Rotary (Germany)				\$78'331	\$77'152		
Rotary (Switzerland & Liechtenstein)	\$344'495	\$344'685	\$332'336	\$295'788	\$296'016	\$321'192	
Siemens			\$10'737				
Soroptimist Int				\$137'192	\$441'408		
Soroptimist Int (Americas)				\$149'577	\$188'829		
Soroptimist Int (Europe)				\$136'404	\$179'613		
Soroptimist Int (Great Britain and Ireland)						\$255'425	
Soros Foundation			\$30'000	\$485'000	\$55'000		
SPEM			\$50'102				
UEFA			\$897'345	\$384'540	\$207'200		
Zurich, Canton of					\$94'720		
Totals	\$815'752	\$915'276	\$2'376'445	\$3'130'780	\$2'598'184	\$950'463	\$10'786'900

Sources of data used in this table:

black = International Trust Fund newsletters and reports

orange = ICRC Mine Action Special Reports

green = Canadian Landmine Foundation Reports

brown = Organization's web site or direct from the organization

As of 30 January 2003

Annex I

Responses to the Contact Group Coordinator's question: "If relevant, to what extent has mine action been incorporated into your country's development plans and/or poverty reduction strategies?"

Chad

The mine action activities are fully co-ordinated with other social-economic development programmes and that is why the HCND (National High Commission for Demining) rests within the Ministry of Economic Development and Co-operation. The Mine Action Strategy is integrated into the National Strategy for poverty reduction by the year 2015.

Croatia

Mine clearance is involved from the very beginning into:

- Reconstruction and return process according to the plans of the Ministry for Public Works, Reconstruction and Building Construction.
- All projects of Regional and National CARDS programme
- All projects of reconstruction of public companies infrastructure (Croatian Railroads, Croatian Roads, Croatian waters, Croatian electric-power industry and others).
- In construction of the Zagreb-Split highway as a separate part.
- All projects of reconstruction of state border facilities and border crossings.
- All problems of fire and flood protection.
- Projects of national parks and parks of nature.
- All priorities of reconstruction set by country, cities and municipal levels.

Honduras

There is a general strategy to reduce the threat, caused by the mine action and incorporate the affected areas into the productive country development, in order to contribute with the poverty reduction planning.

Jordan

All mines based in Jordan within a very rich area for cultivation, also have located in inhabitant areas, holly sites, social developing areas, and important investment sites, however these mines contradict to bring up many developing plans which may reduce poverty rated for local societies, in addition to increase of mine victims number each year who mostly are the working member in the family.

Malawi

The government does not have a separate budget for mine action. The government, however, recognizes the dangers caused by landmines. Even recently in year 2000, two (2) people were killed by anti-personnel mines and three (3) others injured in Muloza River near the border of Mozambique. This situation creates a lot of fear that most areas which were to be used for agriculture are abandoned.

Malawi plans to spare special funds towards mine effort in the next financial year beginning July 2003. This will enable achieving a mine free country allow more development projects thereby contributing to the reduction of poverty which to the main effort by the Malawi Government.

Mauritania

Géré par une commission nationale chargée de l'application du traité d'Ottawa qui est composée des représentants des Ministères de souveraineté des partenaires et des représentants de la société civile.

Le déminage humanitaire est une composante du plan sectoriel du développement et de lutte contre la pauvreté.

Peru

La acción de desminado del ejército del Perú ha recuperado tierras para la producción en los sectores de Bocatoma La Palma y Puente Internacional Hito Grau. Además ha impulsado el fomento a la confianza entre las fuerzas armadas del Perú y del Ecuador mediante el empleo combinado de fuerzas de los dos países.

Al suscribir el estado peruano en marzo de 1999 la Convención sobre la prohibición del empleo, almacenamiento, producción y sobre su destrucción y transferencia de minas antipersonales y siendo una respuesta global al problema de las minas terrestres y habiendo participando el Ministerio de Educación desde setiembre 2002 en la Comisión de Trabajo propuesta por el Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores. Para el presente año se ha propuesto ejecutar la actividad denominada « Campanas de sensibilización sobre desminado en centros educativos » y tiene por finalidad realizar acciones de prevención con docentes, alumnos y miembros de la comunidad.

Thailand

Mine action has been incorporated into Thailand's development plans/poverty reduction strategies as follows:

1. Reducing the casualty of mine victims
2. Increasing safely mined areas for villagers to make a living
3. Rehabilitation and renovating the routes of water, roads, community areas, and historical sites to increase the people's quality of life

Yemen

Mine Action is a part of the governmental plan and is an important UNDP project. It is included into the UNDP development plans and poverty reduction strategies.

Zimbabwe

- Through reclaiming land cut off by or infested with mines, the government has been reducing poverty by resettling people on productive land.
- The country's tourism industry is greatly being enhanced through the removal of mines from game parks and tourist attraction areas.
- Many developmental infrastructures are now possible both in rural areas and economic zones because of the removal of mines.

Annex II

Responses to the Contact Group Coordinator's question: "If relevant describe how your country has contributed, or is able to contribute, to mine action effort in other countries?"

Chad

Through exchange of experience and ideas with other Programme Directors and their Technical advisors creating a platform for forums and annual meetings. Countries such as Sudan, Mauritania have already expressed an interest to learn from the Chadian experience and are looking forward to visit our Programme.

Croatia

- By activities within SEEMACC (south Eastern Mine Action Coordination Council) through education and cooperation with other Centers in the Region : Azerbaijan (ANAMA), Monte Negro (RCVD), Albania (AMAE), Bosnia and Herzegovina (BHMAG), Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRYMAC), International Trust Fund – SLO – (ITF).
- By exchange of information regarding the education and testing with SWEDEC, GICHD, James Madison University, IRC and centers in Thailand, Cambodia and Azerbaijan.
- By presentation of work and methodologies and cooperation with esteemed governmental and non-governmental organizations.
- By sending teams for the establishment of the MINE ACTION SYSTEM world wide based on the efficient and transparent Croatian model.
- By involvement in the scientific projects like ARC, SMART, PILLAN, MEDDS-NOMASICS, FIDO, BIOSENS, BULRUSH, ORTO-FOTO, MULTI-CRITERIA ANALYSIS and COUNTRY MINE ACTION PLANS.

Honduras

Honduras has contributed to the mine action effort in Costa Rica and Guatemala, since November 2002, started to contribute to the mine action effort in Peru.

Jordan

Jordan had built a very qualified Deminers, expertise and managers, with high capability to work according to UN Standards Jordan National Committee for Demining and Rehabilitation (NCDR) look forward to contribute in mine action efforts in other countries if required funds for these efforts are covered by other country or any other

Malawi

Malawi has attended several conferences where contribution has been in form of knowledge sharing on Mine Action. Malawi is committed to continue participating in these regional and international programmes.

Mauritania

Echange d'expériences, de formation compte tenu de la structure dans la sous région existante.

Nicaragua

En años anteriores, Nicaragua ha aportado expertos zapadores para que supervienen el desminado en Perú y Ecuador. Actualmente se está negociando un convenio de colaboración mutua con el gobierno de Chile.

Peru

La Conformación de compañías de desactivación de minas permitirán al ejercito del Perú contribuir a las operaciones de mantenimiento de paz que conducen las naciones unidas.

Thailand

Thailand does not have any capability to make financial contribution to other countries. However Thailand still cooperates with international countries particularly along the Thai borders to operate mine action effectively.

Yemen

Yemen is the first country in the region to have extensive experience, knowledge and capacity to tackle landmine and UXO problems in a professional way. The Yemen National Mine Action Programmeme would welcome any opportunities to contribute in mine action efforts in the region or anywhere in the world. It is to be mentioned that discussions are underway to assist mine clearance in Lebanon in the near future.

Zimbabwe

Zimbabwe has not contributed to mine action in any mine affected country except during UN Peacekeeping Missions and through contracts with local demining companies in international contracts.

Annex III

Mine Affected States Parties & Poverty Reduction Strategies

Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSP) are designed to provide the basis for assistance from the World Bank and the IMF as well as debt relief under the HIPC initiative. PRSPs should be country-driven, comprehensive in scope, partnership-oriented, and participatory. A country only needs to write a PRSP every three years. However, changes can be made to the content of a PRSP using an Annual Progress Report. **Interim PRSPs** were introduced to avoid delays in receiving assistance. I-PRSPs (I-PRSPs) must include a stocktaking of a country's current poverty reduction strategy and lay out a road-map of how the country is going to develop its full PRSP.

Some States Parties have made mention of mine action within their PRSPs or I-PRSPs, or have noted how their national mine action plans complement their poverty reduction strategies. What follows are lists of mine affected States Parties that have developed either a PRSP or an I-PRSP:

Mine-affected States Parties with a PRSP

Albania	Rwanda
Honduras	Senegal
Malawi	Tajikistan
Mauritania	Uganda
Mozambique	Yemen
Nicaragua	Zambia
Niger	

Mine-affected States Parties with an I-PRSP

Bosnia and Herzegovina	Guinea Bissau
Cambodia	Kenya
Central African Republic	Macedonia
Chad	Moldova
Democratic Republic of the Congo	Sierra Leone
Djibouti	

Source: World Bank web site.

Annex IV

Notes regarding the data in this review

1. Every attempt has been made to use data supplied by the States Parties themselves (i.e., Article 7 reports, data obtained from the UNMAS Mine Action Investments database, from questionnaire responses or through direct communications received from States Parties). To obtain a more complete picture, further data have been obtained from major funding channels (e.g., United Nations Voluntary Trust Fund for Mine Action, International Trust Fund for Mine Action and Victim Assistance, International Committee of the Red Cross) and from Landmine Monitor.
2. Resources reported in tables 1A, 1B, 1C, 1D and 2 may include the value attributed to in-kind contributions by the reporting entity. In most instances in tables 1A, 1B, 1C and 1D, in-kind contributions likely make up only a small proportion of total figures. In table 2, however, in-kind contributions could account for significant portions of the figures noted.
3. Wherever possible, the year-appropriate exchange rates that have been used to convert data into US\$ have been those available on the web site of the US Federal Reserve. When additional information has been required, it has been obtained from the most part from the central bank web site of the country in question.
4. A great deal of caution has been used to ensure that resources have not been double-counted. This caution was applied with particular vigor with respect to resources attributed to the private sector. Hence, while the private sector may in many countries have generated many more resources than are reported in table 4, often it is difficult to ensure with certainty that resources reported have not been counted elsewhere.
5. In preparing this review, no attempt has been made to define “mine action funding” or “resources to achieve the Convention’s humanitarian aims.” Rather, it has been left up to each contributor of information to define such terms for itself.

Annex V

Cautions regarding drawing conclusions from the data in this review

The tables contained in this review provide a simplified global compilation of resources for mine action on the basis of data that have been relatively easily accessible. The following cautions should be taken into consideration in attempting to draw conclusions from these data:

1. While these tables may rate as one of the most extensive collections of aggregate data on mine action funding, it must still be accepted that this is not a complete set of data. Undoubtedly there have been significant contributions made that are not recorded in these tables. In addition, given the complexities associated with obtaining figures on the extent to which States Parties have directed resources towards initiatives that would support the care and rehabilitation of landmine survivors, annual mine action funding figures more often than not will under-represent the true extent of victim assistance funding.
2. The displays of data are not designed to indicate how resources were used, where, for what and by whom. Information or analysis of this sort is available from other sources like the UNMAS Mine Action Investments database and Landmine Monitor.
3. Using the annual totals to proclaim that certain trends exist may be unsound given that the simplicity of the displays may mask important underlying factors that affect annual totals. For example, as tempting as it may be to claim that traditional donor support peaked in 2000, such a claim may not take into consideration the impact that one particular case may have had on the total funding levels in the second half of 1999 and in 2000: the end of the conflict in the Province of Kosovo and the donor response that followed.
4. The need to present data in this review using a common currency may distort the true level of mine action resources provided by entities in any particular year. For example, when denominated in US\$, Germany's contributions increased by 10.47% from 2000 to 2001. However, when denominated in Germany's home currency, Germany's contributions from 2000 to 2001 increased by 13.92%.
5. This review does not provide an indication of the cost of assets, services and investments purchased with the resources that have been recorded and thus a real or perceived reduction in resource contributions from year to year may therefore not be a true indication of the output generated by these resources. That is, one country's currency depreciation relative to the US\$ may not imply a reduction in purchasing power if the costs of these items on a constant basis are denominated in that country's home currency. Similarly, with capacity increases in mine affected countries with relatively lower costs than in donor countries, increasingly resources may be directed towards purchasing these relatively lower cost assets, services and investments.
6. A simplified global overview of the nature presented by this review does not provide an indication of the impact of expected efficiency or productivity gains over time. For example, a contribution that remains constant over time logically should result in increasing outputs.